

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-8 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 7 and 8 are amended herein

[0003] Claim 1 recited aspects of an electronic programming guide, and has been amended to more particularly recite aspects of that guide. In particular, claim 1 was amended to recite a program grid and program tiles. This is supported at least at Fig. 6, and in the discussion of paragraphs [0068] and [0069], wherein details of the program grid 178 and program tiles 184 are discussed. Claim 1 was additionally amended to recite aspects of icons for recording programming and icons for reminding the user of programming. Such icons are disclosed at least by Fig. 6 as icons 196 and 198. Additionally, a recording icon is shown as having been dragged into the “Caroline in the City” program tile. The operation of such icons is discussed at least at paragraphs [0074] and [0075]. Claim 1 was additionally amended to recite the use of a “soft button”. Such buttons allow the user to repeat a prior save search/query by pushing a button. Soft buttons are created when a user saves a query/search, and allows the user to modify (customize) the user interface to include soft buttons associated with frequently used searches. Examples of soft buttons are seen in Fig. 6 at 204, etc., and are discussed at least at paragraph [0077]. Claim 7 was similarly amended, and support for the amendments to claim 7 includes at least the support discussed above. Claim 8 was also similarly amended and supported. However, claim 8 was also

amended to recite aspects of a processor, computer memory and computer readable instructions, which is supported at least by Fig. 5 and associated text.

Claim 8 Recites Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[0004] Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 8 to overcome the Section 101 rejection, as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Legall: Legall et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565
- Maze: Maze et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,216,264
- Coden: Coden et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,873,080
- Bedard: Bedard, U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747

Claims 1 and 4-8 Are Non-Obvious Over Legall, in view of Maze and Coden

[0006] Claims 1 and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Legall, in view of Maze and Coden. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0007] The Applicant submits, particularly in view of the amendments made herein, that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. In particular, the Applicant submits that Legall, Maze and Coden, singly and in combination, do not teach or suggest the all of the features of claim 1, as amended (with emphasis added to facilitate identification of claim elements more particularly discussed, below):

1. (Currently Amended) A method for operating an electronic program guide displaying television programming information, comprising the following steps:

displaying a user interface indicating television programming information comprising a plurality of channels, time periods and programs configured as a program grid comprising program tiles associated with programs, wherein a user can realize when and on what channel a program is offered by viewing a program tile associated with the program, and **wherein the user interface implements recording and reminding functionality by providing icons configured to be dragged and dropped by the user into a program tile associated with any program, where the icons can be seen after being dropped, to indicate desire by the user to record the program or be reminded of the program, respectively;**

generating a query, in response to activation by the user of a query generating button defined by the user interface, wherein the activation of the query generating button results in display of a find window of the user interface to assist the user in creating a query, wherein the query defines a search of an electronic programming guide database, **wherein the user interface is configured to allow the user to save the query, and wherein the saving results in creation of a soft button, defined on the**

user interface, such that operation of the soft button allows a user to quickly retrieve and operate the saved query;

receiving search parameters from the find window, the parameters comprising: genre; network; rating; and program name;

displaying an advanced find window in response to selection of an advanced query button within the find window, wherein the advanced find window allows search by additional search parameters including keywords, wherein the advanced find window defines a plurality of user created searches, wherein a user created search may be saved by the user by associating the search with a tabbed folder, and wherein tabbed folders may be created and removed by operation of buttons within the advanced find window;

querying the electronic programming guide database using filters, comprising:

a filter finding program types desired by the user; and

a filter removing program types not desired by the user; and

unifying plural queries using a unified query function configured to combine queries of plural individuals into a unified query, wherein the combining is performed by a Boolean AND or OR function.

[0008] Claim 1 recites in part, “wherein the user interface implements recording and reminding functionality by providing icons configured to be dragged and dropped by the user into a program tile associated with any program, where the icons can be seen after being dropped, to indicate desire by the user to record the program or be reminded of the program, respectively” (emphasis added). Because the claim has been amended to recite this element, the Office has not cited art against it. However, a review of the art of record does not reveal any disclosure and/or discussion, by Legall, Maze and/or Coden, of the use of such drag and drop icons, in conjunction with program tiles in a

program grid of an electronic program guide, to facilitate recording and reminding functionality. Consequently, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

[0009] Claim 1 recites in part, “wherein the user interface is configured to allow the user to save the query, and wherein the saving results in creation of a soft button, defined on the user interface, such that operation of the soft button allows a user to quickly retrieve and operate the saved query” (emphasis added). Because the claim has been amended to recite this element, the Office has not cited art against it. However, a review of the art of record does not reveal any disclosure and/or discussion, by Legall, Maze and/or Coden, of a user interface configured to save searches and to create a soft button, defined on the user interface, to assist the user in later repeating the search. The Applicant emphasizes the nature of the search saving process, which creates an actual button on the user interface for the user’s later use. For example, the user has created “Star Trek” and “Old Movies” soft buttons 204, 210 in the example user interface of Fig. 6 in the Applicant’s specification. The discussion of soft buttons at paragraph [0077] provides additional detail on this process. In view of this claim amendment, the Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-6

[0010] Claims 2-6 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-6 are also allowable

over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claims 7 and 8

[0011] The Applicant submits, particularly in view of the amendments made herein, that claims 7 and 8 are allowable over the prior art of record. In particular, the Applicant submits that Legall, Maze and Coden, singly and in combination, do not teach or suggest the all of the features of these claims. The Applicant hereby incorporates the arguments and remarks from above, with respect to claim 1, at this location. Moreover, the Applicant submits that these claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0012] The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/David S. Thompson 37954/
David S. Thompson
Registration No. 37954

Dated: 03 September 2009

davidt@leehayes.com
509-944-4735